

Application Number: 09/738,208

Docket Number: 10005368-1

REMARKS

Upon entry of this Response, claims 2-11 and 13-20 remain pending in the present patent application. Claims 2, 4-7, 9-11, 13, and 15-20 have been amended. Applicant requests reconsideration of the pending claims in view of the following remarks.

In item 5 of the Office Action, claims 1-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Publication 005953733A filed by Langford-Wilson (hereafter "*Langford*") in view of U.S. Patent 6,223,191 issued to Truelson (hereafter "*Truelson*"). A prima facie case of obviousness is established only when the prior art teaches or suggests all of the elements of the claims. MPEP §2143.03, In re Rijckaert, 9 F.3d 1531, 28 U.S.P.Q2d 1955, 1956 (Fed. Cir. 1993). For the reasons that follow, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 1-27 be withdrawn.

To begin, claim 2 has been amended to recite as follows:

2. A system for pruning an article, comprising:
a processor circuit having a processor and a memory;
and
an original article comprising an amount of text expressing an amount of conceptual information;
article pruning logic stored on the memory and executable by the processor, the article pruning logic comprising logic to automatically reduce a length of the original article to fit within a predefined space allocation of a publication comprising:
logic to create a pruning copy of the original article to be reduced;
logic to remove an amount of text from the pruning copy, thereby creating a reduced pruning copy, wherein an amount of text in the reduced pruning copy is less than the amount of text in the original article; and
logic to determine whether the conceptual information as expressed by the text of the reduced pruning copy is compromised relative to the conceptual information as expressed by the text of the original article.

As cited above, claim 2 recites that the system includes logic to determine whether the conceptual information as expressed by the text of the reduced printing copy is compromised relative to the conceptual information as expressed by the text of the original article. In this respect, the determination is made as to whether the concepts described by the text of the reduced printing copy are still described with sufficiency for publishing relative to the discussion of such concepts in the original

Application Number: 09/738,208Docket Number: 10005368-1

article. Applicant asserts that the cited combination of references fail to show or suggest at least this element.


In particular, *Truelson* describes comparisons of lines of text of paragraphs that are altered in order to find a best format of the paragraphs. There is no determination as to whether any conceptual information expressed by such text is compromised relative to the conceptual information described in an original document as set forth in amended claim 2. Applicant asserts that *Langford* fails to show or suggest such a feature as well.

Accordingly, for at least this reason, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claim 2 be withdrawn. In addition, claims 7, and 13 have been amended to include the fact that a determination is made as to whether the conceptual information as expressed by the text of the reduced printed copy is compromised relative to the conceptual information as expressed by the text of the original article. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 7 and 13 also be withdrawn for the reasons described above. In addition, dependent claims 4-6, 9-11, and 15-20 have been amended so as to be compatible with the amendments made to independent claims 2, 7, or 13. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of claims 3-6, 8-11, and 14-20 be withdrawn as depending from claims 2, 7, or 13.

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully requests that all outstanding objections and rejections be withdrawn and that this application and all presently pending claims be allowed to issue. If the Examiner has any questions or comments regarding Applicant's response, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone Applicant's undersigned counsel.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael J. D'Aurelio
Reg. No. 40,977

Thomas, Kayden, Horstemeyer & Risley, L.L.P.
100 Galleria Parkway, N.W.
Suite 1750
Atlanta, Georgia 30339-5948
Phone: (770) 933-9500
Fax: (770) 951-9300